

### REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11, 12, 14, and 20 are pending in this application. Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11, 14, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. patent application publication 2003/0070173 to Nakano et al. (herein "Nakano") in view of U.S. patent application publication 2008/0092168 to Logan et al. (herein "Logan"). Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Nakano in view of Logan as applied to claim 7, and further in view of U.S. patent application publication 2001/0049826 to Wilf. Those rejections are traversed by the present response as now discussed.

Independent claim 1 clarifies certain features therein, and now specifically recites the synchronizing portion is configured "to search for another feature amount corresponding to the extracted feature amount in associated media data and associated with the metadata". The above-noted feature is believed to be clear from the original specification, see for example page 23, line 11 et seq. and Figures 7 and 8. As noted in that portion of the specification, corresponding feature amounts in both metadata and associated media data are extracted and searched for to provide a synchronization operation. That is, a feature amount is extracted from stored metadata, and another feature amount corresponding to that extracted feature amount is searched for in associated media data. Such an extracted feature amount and a searched for corresponding feature amount can be utilized to synchronize the metadata with the associated media data to correct time differences between the metadata and the media data. Such features recited in independent claim 1, and thereby the claims dependent therefrom, are believed to clearly distinguish over the applied art.

With respect to the above-noted feature the outstanding Office Action appears to recognize Nakano does not disclose or suggest the claimed "synchronizing portion", and the outstanding Office Action now cites Logan with respect to such features specifically stating:

However, in an analogous art, Logan teaches a set-top box ([0019]-[0023]) that receives metadata for video content that includes not only information about displaying time of the content, but other feature amount information ([0077]-[0084])) that will help to synchronize video data with its respective metadata to solve a time shift or time difference problem ([0083]).<sup>1</sup>

In reply to that grounds for the rejection, applicants respectfully submit Logan does not cure the recognized deficiencies in Nakano as Logan also does not disclose or suggest synchronizing *video data and its metadata*, and instead Logan merely discloses synchronizing two different versions of the same content.

In further detail, for example at cited paragraph [0083] Logan specifically discloses utilizing pattern-matching techniques so that different pieces of content stored at a storage 103 and a storage 143 will be compared. Logan also specifically states in paragraph [0083] that “[m]ultiple fingerprints may be used in order to continually *synchronize the two versions*” (emphasis added).

From such disclosure applicants submit it is clear that Logan discloses synchronizing two different versions of content.

In contrast to Logan, in the claims as written the feature amount extracted from stored metadata can be correlated with a corresponding feature amount in associated media data. Thereby, the claimed “synchronizing portion” extracts a feature amount that is stored in the metadata for comparison with a corresponding feature amount searched for in media data. Logan does not disclose or suggest any such synchronization between a feature amount extracted from metadata and a corresponding feature amount searched for in media data. In Logan two different version of contents, for example two different versions of media data, are compared for synchronization.

---

<sup>1</sup> Office Action of October 29, 2008, page 4, first full paragraph.

Logan also indicates a “signal pattern” or “fingerprint”, which the Office Action appears to indicate corresponds to the claimed “feature amount”, is extracted or derived from *content* (see Logan at paragraph [0080] lines 1-2). Thereby, in Logan the “signal pattern” or “fingerprint” exists only in the content, and such a noted “signal pattern” or “fingerprint” is not extracted or derived from metadata, in contrast to independent claim 1 as currently written.

Thereby applicants respectfully submit Logan does not disclose or suggest the features in the claimed “synchronizing portion”, and thereby Logan cannot cure the recognized deficiencies in Nakano with respect to the features recited in independent claim 1.

In view of the foregoing comments Applicants respectfully submit amended independent claim 1, and thereby the claims dependent therefrom, patentably distinguish over Nakano in view of Logan.

With respect to independent claim 7, independent claim 7 now makes a clarification and recites “*incrementing a value associated with the metadata creator* each time the specific metadata is exchanged among the plurality of client media data audio-visual devices” (emphasis added). Applicants respectfully submit neither Nakano nor Logan disclose or suggest incrementing a value associated with a metadata creator each time specific metadata is exchanged.

With respect to the above-noted features the outstanding rejection appears to cite Nakano at paragraphs [0166]-[0167], specifically stating in the Office Action:

... Every time a client requests for metadata content, a counter is increased, and if the count surpasses a threshold value, a request for changing the metadata database at the server from a client is registered, [0166]-[0167].<sup>2</sup>

In reply to that grounds for the rejection applicants note cited paragraphs [0166]-[0167] in Nakano disclose counting a number of inquiries, but Nakano fails to disclose or

---

<sup>2</sup> Office Action of October 29, 2008, page 7, first paragraph.

suggest incrementing a value associated with the metadata creator. The inquiries noted in Nakano are *not directed to the metadata creator*. Thereby, Nakano does not disclose or suggest the above-noted feature recited in independent claim 7.

Moreover, applicants note Logan merely discloses storing information about a creator of a metadata, such as its location, but Logan also does not disclose or suggest any incrementing of a value associated with a metadata creator, thus Logan could not cure the deficiencies of Nakano with respect to such features.

Thereby, applicants respectfully submit amended independent claim 7 as currently written, and thereby the claims dependent therefrom, also distinguish over the applied art of Nakano in view of Logan.

Moreover, no disclosures in Wilf were cited with respect to the above-discussed features, and no disclosures in Wilf are believed to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Nakano in view of Logan.


In view of the foregoing comments, applicants respectfully submit the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413-2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Eckhard H. Kuesters  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 28,870

Surinder Sachar  
Registration No. 34,423